

Smooth min-max relative entropy based bounds for one-shot classical and quantum state redistribution

Anurag Anshu^{*} Rahul Jain[†] Naqeeb Ahmad Warsi[‡]

Abstract

We study the problem of state redistribution both in the classical (shared randomness assisted) and quantum (entanglement assisted) one-shot settings and provide new upper bounds on the communication required. Our classical bounds are in terms of smooth-min and max relative entropies and the quantum bounds are in terms of max relative entropy and Renyi relative entropy of order $\frac{1}{2}$. We also consider a special case of this problem in the classical setting, previously studied by Braverman and Rao (2011). We show that their upper bound is optimal. In addition we provide an alternate protocol achieving a priori different looking upper bound. However, we show that our upper bound is essentially the same as their upper bound and hence also optimal. For the quantum case, we show that our achievability result is upper bounded by the achievability result obtained in Berta, Christandl, Touchette (2016).

1 Introduction

Quantum state redistribution is a well studied task in both in the asymptotic and the one-shot settings [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. In this work we provide a new upper bound on the communication needed to accomplish this task (with a small error) using entanglement assisted one-shot protocols. We also consider classical analogue of this task which we call as *classical state redistribution*. We provide optimal (upper and lower) bounds on the amount of communication needed for this task using shared randomness assisted one-shot protocols.

To arrive at our result, we consider a simpler communication task: Alice possesses random variables XM , Bob possesses random variable Y , where $Y - X - M$ is a Markov chain. Alice wants to transfer M to Bob with a small error. This task was first considered by [10], wherein they provided an upper bound on the communication (without an optimality proof). We show that their upper bound is optimal. In addition we provide an alternate protocol achieving a priori different looking upper bound. However, we show that our upper bound is essentially the same as the upper bound by [10] and hence also optimal. We provide a quantum protocol for quantum state redistribution based on our classical protocol mentioned above.

To design our classical protocol, we use the techniques of rejection sampling and hypothesis testing. For our quantum protocol we use the techniques of convex split [9] (which can be viewed as a coherent quantum analogue of rejection sampling technique) and pretty good measurement.

The work [8] obtained a one-shot achievability bound on the task of quantum state redistribution. This bound has several interesting properties: it approaches the quantum conditional mutual information in

^{*}Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore. a0109169@u.nus.edu

[†]Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore and MajuLab, UMI 3654, Singapore. rahul@comp.nus.edu.sg

[‡]Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore and School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore and IIITD, Delhi. warsi.naqeeb@gmail.com

asymptotic setting and in one shot setting, it is upper bounded by $I(R : C|B)_\Psi / \varepsilon^2$ (upto multiplicative constants), where ε is an error parameter and Ψ_{RABC} is the state on which quantum state redistribution has to be performed. We show that our achievability result for quantum state redistribution is upper bounded by the achievability result in [8] and hence is also upper bounded by $I(R : C|B)_\Psi / \varepsilon^2$ (upto multiplicative constants). The asymptotic behaviour of our bound can be independently established by appealing to asymptotic equipartition properties of smooth max and min relative entropies [11, 12].

Organisation of the paper

We introduce our notations and notions used throughout the paper in Section 2. In Section 3 we describe our achievability and converse bounds for the task of classical state redistribution. These results are heavily based on a series of results shown in 4, where we prove the optimality of Braverman -Rao protocol and present a new protocol using extension states. Furthermore, in this section, we prove the equivalence of bounds obtained by these two different techniques. In Section 5, we present a new protocol for quantum state redistribution, inspired by the classical protocols developed in earlier sections. In the same section, we make comparison of this protocol with previous work.

2 Preliminaries

Classical information theory

Given a random variable X taking values in a set $\mathcal{X}$, we will represent the probability of an $x \in \mathcal{X}$ as $\Pr_X(x)$. We will represent the logarithm of support size of X with $|\mathcal{X}|$. Given two random variables X, Y we represent by $X \otimes Y$ the joint random variable such that $\Pr_{X \otimes Y}(x, y) = \Pr_X(x) \cdot \Pr_Y(y)$. If the random variable XYZ forms a Markov chain with Y, Z being independent conditioned on X , we shall represent it, notationally, as $X - Y - Z$. Given a random variable X , we define $\text{supp}(X)$ as the set of all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $\Pr_X(x) > 0$. Given a joint random variable $XY \in \mathcal{X} \otimes \mathcal{Y}$, we denote the random variable on $\mathcal{X}$ conditioned on Y taking the value y as X_y . The distance measure that we use is the trace distance, which is defined as: for random variables $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{X}$, $\|X_1 - X_2\|_1 := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |\Pr_{X_1}(x) - \Pr_{X_2}(x)|$. We also define fidelity: $F(X_1, X_2) = \sum_x \sqrt{\Pr_{X_1}(x) \Pr_{X_2}(x)}$.

Following fact is well known.

Fact 1. For random variables X_1, X_2 over the same set $\mathcal{X}$, it holds that

$$1 - F(X_1, X_2) \leq \frac{1}{2} \|X_1 - X_2\|_1 \leq \sqrt{1 - F^2(X_1, X_2)}.$$

Given two random variables X, X' , we define

- $D_\infty(X \| X') := \max_x \log \frac{\Pr_X(x)}{\Pr_{X'}(x)}$.
- $D_\infty^\varepsilon(X \| X') := \min_{\|X'' - X\| \leq \varepsilon} D_\infty(X'' \| X')$.
- $D_s^\varepsilon(X \| X') := \inf \{a : \Pr_{x \leftarrow X}(\frac{\Pr_X(x)}{\Pr_{X'}(x)} > 2^a) < \varepsilon\}$.
- $D_H^\varepsilon(X \| X') := \max_{\mathcal{A}} \{\log \frac{1}{\Pr_{X'}(\mathcal{A})} : \Pr_X(\mathcal{A}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon\}$

Fact 2. Given a random variable X and an event $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\Pr_X(\mathcal{A}) = p$. Let the random variable X_1 represent X conditioned on event $\mathcal{A}$. Then for all x , $\Pr_{X_1}(x) \leq \frac{\Pr_X(x)}{p}$.

Proof. We use Bayes' theorem to proceed as follows.

$$\Pr_{X_1}(x) = \Pr_X(x|\mathcal{A}) = \frac{\Pr_X(x, \mathcal{A})}{\Pr_X(\mathcal{A})} \leq \frac{\Pr_X(x)}{\Pr_X(\mathcal{A})}.$$

□

Fact 3. For $(0 \leq x \leq 1, y \geq 0)$, it holds that

$$(1-x)^y \leq e^{-xy} \quad \text{and} \quad e^{-xy} \leq 1-x+e^{-y}.$$

Fact 4. Let $XY \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ be a joint random variable and $\varepsilon > 0$ be a constant. Then it holds that $D_s^\varepsilon(XY \| X \otimes Y) \leq |Y| + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$.

Proof. Let Good be set of all $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\Pr_Y(y) \geq \varepsilon \cdot 2^{-|B|}$ and Bad be rest of the y . We have that $\Pr_{XY}(\text{Bad}) = \Pr_Y(\text{Bad}) \leq \sum_y \varepsilon \cdot 2^{-|B|} \leq \varepsilon$. Moreover, for all $y \in \text{Good}$, $\frac{\Pr_{XY}(x,y)}{\Pr_X(x) \cdot \Pr_Y(y)} = \frac{\Pr_{Y|X}(y)}{\Pr_Y(y)} \leq \frac{2^{|B|}}{\varepsilon}$. Thus, by definition, we obtain that $D_s^\varepsilon(XY \| X \otimes Y) \leq |B| + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. $\square$

Fact 5 ([11]). Let X, X' be probability distributions. It holds that

$$D_\infty^\varepsilon(X \| X') \geq D_s^{2\varepsilon}(X \| X') - 2 \log\left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

Proof. The proof is essentially that given in [11] (Proposition 13). Let X'' be the random variable achieving the infimum in the definition of $D_\infty^\varepsilon(X \| X') \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a$. Then as shown in [11] (proof of Proposition 13), for every $\delta' > 0$, it holds that $\Pr_{x \leftarrow X}(\frac{\Pr_X(x)}{\Pr_{X'}(x)} < 2^{a+\delta'}) \geq (\sqrt{1-\varepsilon} - 2^{-\delta'/2})^2$. Setting $\delta' = 2 \log \frac{2}{\varepsilon}$, we find that $a + \delta'$ is a feasible solution for $D_s^{2\varepsilon}(X \| X')$. This proves the fact. $\square$

The following protocol was given by Braverman and Rao [10].

Lemma 1 (Braverman and Rao protocol, [10]). Let Alice be given a probability distribution P and Bob be given a probability distribution Q . Suppose Alice and Bob know an upper bound c on the value of $D_\infty(P \| Q)$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a randomness assisted one-way protocol with communication cost $c + \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})$ such that Bob correctly outputs the distribution P with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$.

An immediate corollary to this is the following.

Corollary 1. Let Alice be given a probability distribution P and Bob be given a probability distribution Q . Fix an $\varepsilon > 0$. Suppose Alice and Bob know an upper bound c on the value of $D_s^\varepsilon(P \| Q)$. Then there exists a randomness assisted one-way protocol with communication cost $c + \log(\frac{2}{\varepsilon})$ such that Bob outputs a distribution P' such that $\|P' - P\|_1 \leq 3\varepsilon$.

Proof. From the definition of $D_s^\varepsilon(P \| Q)$, it holds that $\Pr_{p \leftarrow P}(\frac{\Pr_P(p)}{\Pr_Q(p)} \geq 2^c) \leq \varepsilon$. Let the set of p be Good if $\frac{\Pr_P(p)}{\Pr_Q(p)} < 2^c$. Define a distribution P'' as $\Pr_{P''}(p) = \frac{\Pr_P(p)}{\Pr_P(\text{Good})}$ if $p \in \text{Good}$, and 0 otherwise. Then it holds that $\|P'' - P\|_1 \leq 2\varepsilon$ and

$$2^{D_\infty(P'' \| Q)} = \frac{1}{\Pr_P(\text{Good})} \cdot \max_{p \in \text{Good}} \frac{\Pr_P(p)}{\Pr_Q(p)} \leq \frac{2^c}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

Suppose Alice were given the distribution P'' and Bob were given the distribution Q and they knew $c + \log(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon})$. Consider the protocol $\mathcal{Q}$ as defined by Lemma 1. With probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$ it correctly outputs the distribution P'' . The protocol $\mathcal{Q}$ when run on the distribution P , thus produces a distribution P' such that $\|P' - P\|_1 \leq 3\varepsilon$. The communication cost is at most $c + \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) + \log(\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}) \leq c + \log(\frac{2}{\varepsilon})$. This proves the corollary. $\square$

Quantum information theory

Consider a finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ endowed with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ (In this paper, we only consider finite dimensional Hilbert-spaces). The ℓ_1 norm of an operator X on $\mathcal{H}$ is $\|X\|_1 := \text{Tr} \sqrt{X^\dagger X}$ and ℓ_2 norm is $\|X\|_2 := \sqrt{\text{Tr} X X^\dagger}$. A quantum state (or a density matrix or a state) is a positive semi-definite matrix on $\mathcal{H}$ with trace equal to 1. It is called *pure* if and only if its rank is 1. A sub-normalized state is a positive semi-definite matrix on $\mathcal{H}$ with trace less than or equal to 1. Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a unit vector on $\mathcal{H}$, that is $\langle \psi, \psi \rangle = 1$. With some abuse of notation, we use ψ to represent the state and also the density matrix $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, associated with $|\psi\rangle$. Given a quantum state ρ on $\mathcal{H}$, *support of ρ* , called $\text{supp}(\rho)$ is the subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ spanned by all eigen-vectors of ρ with non-zero eigenvalues.

A *quantum register* A is associated with some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. Define $|A| := \dim(\mathcal{H}_A)$. Let $\mathcal{L}(A)$ represent the set of all linear operators on $\mathcal{H}_A$. We denote by $\mathcal{D}(A)$, the set of quantum states on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. State ρ with subscript A indicates $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. If two registers A, B are associated with the same Hilbert space, we shall represent the relation by $A \equiv B$. Composition of two registers A and B , denoted AB , is associated with Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. For two quantum states $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(B)$, $\rho \otimes \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ represents the tensor product (Kronecker product) of ρ and σ . The identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_A$ (and associated register A) is denoted I_A .

Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$. We define

$$\rho_B := \text{Tr}_A \rho_{AB} := \sum_i (\langle i| \otimes I_B) \rho_{AB} (|i\rangle \otimes I_B),$$

where $\{|i\rangle\}_i$ is an orthonormal basis for the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$. The state $\rho_B \in \mathcal{D}(B)$ is referred to as the marginal state of ρ_{AB} . Unless otherwise stated, a missing register from subscript in a state will represent partial trace over that register. Given a $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, a *purification* of ρ_A is a pure state $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ such that $\text{Tr}_B \rho_{AB} = \rho_A$. Purification of a quantum state is not unique.

A quantum map $\mathbb{E} : \mathcal{L}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(B)$ is a completely positive and trace preserving (CPTP) linear map (mapping states in $\mathcal{D}(A)$ to states in $\mathcal{D}(B)$). A *unitary* operator $U_A : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_A$ is such that $U_A^\dagger U_A = U_A U_A^\dagger = I_A$. An *isometry* $V : \mathcal{H}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_B$ is such that $V^\dagger V = I_A$ and $V V^\dagger = I_B$. The set of all unitary operations on register A is denoted by $\mathcal{U}(A)$.

Definition 1. We shall consider the following information theoretic quantities. Reader is referred to [13, 14, 15, 16] for many of these definitions. We consider only normalized states in the definitions below. Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

1. **Fidelity** For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$F(\rho_A, \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\sqrt{\rho_A} \sqrt{\sigma_A}\|_1.$$

For classical probability distributions $P = \{p_i\}, Q = \{q_i\}$,

$$F(P, Q) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i \sqrt{p_i \cdot q_i}.$$

2. **Purified distance** For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$P(\rho_A, \sigma_A) = \sqrt{1 - F^2(\rho_A, \sigma_A)}.$$

3. **ε -ball** For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$\mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\rho'_A \in \mathcal{D}(A) \mid P(\rho_A, \rho'_A) \leq \varepsilon\}.$$

4. **Von-neumann entropy** For $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$S(\rho_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\text{Tr}(\rho_A \log \rho_A).$$

5. **Relative entropy** For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ such that $\text{supp}(\rho_A) \subset \text{supp}(\sigma_A)$,

$$D(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}(\rho_A \log \rho_A) - \text{Tr}(\rho_A \log \sigma_A).$$

6. **Max-relative entropy** For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$ such that $\text{supp}(\rho_A) \subset \text{supp}(\sigma_A)$,

$$D_{\max}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf\{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : 2^\lambda \sigma_A \geq \rho_A\}.$$

7. **Smooth min-relative entropy** For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$D_{\text{H}}^\varepsilon(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{0 < \Pi < I, \text{Tr}(\Pi \rho_A) \geq 1 - \varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{1}{\text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma_A)}\right).$$

8. **Renyi relative entropy of order $\frac{1}{2}$** For $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,

$$D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho_A \| \sigma_A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -2 \log F(\rho_A, \sigma_A).$$

9. **Mutual information** For $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$,

$$I(A : B)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S(\rho_A) + S(\rho_B) - S(\rho_{AB}) = D(\rho_{AB} \| \rho_A \otimes \rho_B).$$

10. **Conditional mutual information** For $\rho_{ABC} \in \mathcal{D}(ABC)$,

$$I(A : B | C)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} I(A : BC)_\rho - I(A : C)_\rho.$$

11. **Max-information** For $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$,

$$I_{\max}(A : B)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{D}(B)} D_{\max}(\rho_{AB} \| \rho_A \otimes \sigma_B).$$

12. **Smooth max-information** For $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$,

$$I_{\max}^\varepsilon(A : B)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\rho' \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho)} I_{\max}(A : B)_{\rho'}.$$

13. **Conditional min-entropy**

$$H_{\min}(A|B)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} - \inf_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{D}(B)} D_{\max}(\rho_{AB} \| I_A \otimes \sigma_B).$$

14. **Conditional max-entropy**

$$H_{\max}(A|B)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{\sigma_B \in \mathcal{D}(B)} \log F^2(\rho_{AB}, I_A \otimes \sigma_B).$$

15. **Smooth conditional min-entropy**

$$H_{\min}^\varepsilon(A|B)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{\rho' \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho)} H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho'}.$$

16. **Smooth conditional max-entropy**

$$H_{\max}^\varepsilon(A|B)_\rho \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\rho' \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho)} H_{\max}(A|B)_{\rho'}.$$

We will use the following facts.

Fact 6 (Triangle inequality for purified distance, [15]). *For states $\rho_A, \sigma_A, \tau_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$,*

$$P(\rho_A, \sigma_A) \leq P(\rho_A, \tau_A) + P(\tau_A, \sigma_A).$$

Fact 7 ([17]). (*Stinespring representation*) *Let $\mathbb{E}(\cdot) : \mathcal{L}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(B)$ be a quantum operation. There exists a register C and an unitary $U \in \mathcal{U}(ABC)$ such that $\mathbb{E}(\omega) = \text{Tr}_{A,C} (U(\omega \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|^{B,C})U^\dagger)$. Stinespring representation for a channel is not unique.*

Fact 8 (Monotonicity under quantum operations, [18],[19]). *For quantum states $\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{D}(A)$, and quantum operation $\mathbb{E}(\cdot) : \mathcal{L}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(B)$, it holds that*

$$\|\mathbb{E}(\rho) - \mathbb{E}(\sigma)\|_1 \leq \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \quad \text{and} \quad F(\mathbb{E}(\rho), \mathbb{E}(\sigma)) \geq F(\rho, \sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad D(\rho\|\sigma) \geq D(\mathbb{E}(\rho)\|\mathbb{E}(\sigma)).$$

In particular, for bipartite states $\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$, it holds that

$$\|\rho_{AB} - \sigma_{AB}\|_1 \geq \|\rho_A - \sigma_A\|_1 \quad \text{and} \quad F(\rho_{AB}, \sigma_{AB}) \leq F(\rho_A, \sigma_A) \quad \text{and} \quad D(\rho_{AB}\|\sigma_{AB}) \geq D(\rho_A\|\sigma_A).$$

Fact 9 (Uhlmann's theorem, [20]). *Let $\rho_A, \sigma_A \in \mathcal{D}(A)$. Let $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{D}(AB)$ be a purification of ρ_A and $\sigma_{AC} \in \mathcal{D}(AC)$ be a purification of σ_A . There exists an isometry $V : C \rightarrow B$ such that,*

$$F(|\theta\rangle\langle\theta|_{AB}, |\rho\rangle\langle\rho|_{AB}) = F(\rho_A, \sigma_A),$$

where $|\theta\rangle_{AB} = (I_A \otimes V)|\sigma\rangle_{AC}$.

Fact 10 (Gentle measurement lemma, [21, 22]). *Let ρ be a quantum state and $0 < A < I$ be an operator. Then*

$$F(\rho, \frac{A\rho A}{\text{Tr}(A^2\rho)}) \geq \sqrt{\text{Tr}(A^2\rho)}.$$

Proof. Let $|\rho\rangle$ be a purification of ρ . Then $(I \otimes A)|\rho\rangle$ is a purification of $A\rho A$. Now, applying monotonicity of fidelity under quantum operations (Fact 8), we find

$$F(\rho, \frac{A\rho A}{\text{Tr}(A^2\rho)}) \geq F(|\rho\rangle\langle\rho|, \frac{(I \otimes A)|\rho\rangle\langle\rho|(I \otimes A^\dagger)}{\text{Tr}(A^2\rho)}) = \sqrt{\frac{\text{Tr}(A\rho)^2}{\text{Tr}(A^2\rho)}} > \sqrt{\text{Tr}(A^2\rho)}.$$

In last inequality, we have used $A > A^2$. □

Following fact is an extension of the Gentle measurement lemma.

Fact 11. *Consider a quantum state $\rho_A = \sum_i p_i \rho_A^i$ and a map $\mathcal{A}(X) = \sum_i P_i X P_i \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_O$, such that $0 < P_i < I, \sum_i P_i^2 = I$ (O is considered the output register for the measurement $\mathcal{A}$). Define the state $\rho'_{AO} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_i p_i \rho_A^i \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_O$ and let $q_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}(P_i^2 \rho_A^i)$. Then it holds that*

$$F(\rho'_{AO}, \mathcal{A}(\rho_A)) \geq (\sum_i p_i q_i)^{3/2}.$$

Proof. We abbreviate $\sigma_{AO} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{A}(\rho_A)$. This implies that

$$\sigma_{AO} = \sum_{i,j} p_i P_j \rho_A^i P_j \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|_O.$$

Define

$$\sigma_{AO}^{\text{good}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\sum_i p_i q_i} \sum_i p_i P_i \rho_A^i P_i \otimes |i\rangle\langle i|_O \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{AO}^{\text{bad}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{1 - \sum_i p_i q_i} \sum_{i \neq j} p_i P_j \rho_A^i P_j \otimes |j\rangle\langle j|_O.$$

Then we can decompose σ_{AO} as

$$\sigma_{AO} = \left(\sum_i p_i q_i \right) \sigma_{AO}^{good} + \left(1 - \sum_i p_i q_i \right) \sigma_{AO}^{bad}.$$

From concavity of fidelity, this gives us

$$\begin{aligned} F(\sigma_{AO}, \rho'_{AO}) &\geq \left(\sum_i p_i q_i \right) F(\sigma_{AO}^{good}, \rho'_{AO}) \\ &= \left(\sum_i p_i q_i \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_i p_i q_i}} \sum_i p_i \sqrt{q_i} \cdot F\left(\frac{P_i \rho_A^i P_i}{q_i}, \rho_A^i\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now employing Gentle measurement lemma (Fact 10), we conclude that

$$F(\sigma_{AO}, \rho'_{AO}) \geq \sqrt{\sum_i p_i q_i} \left(\sum_i p_i \sqrt{q_i} \cdot \sqrt{q_i} \right) = \left(\sum_i p_i q_i \right)^{3/2}.$$

□

Fact 12 (Pretty-good measurement, [25]). *Consider an ensemble $\{p_k, \rho_A^k\}$ such that $\sum_k p_k = 1$. Define $\rho_A = \sum_k p_k \rho_A^k$. Then it holds that*

$$\sum_k p_k^2 \text{Tr}(\rho_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_A^k \rho_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_A^k) \geq 1 - \sum_{k \neq k'} \sqrt{p_k p_{k'}} F(\rho_A^k, \rho_A^{k'}).$$

Above two facts directly imply the following.

Fact 13. *Consider an ensemble $\{p_k, \rho_{AB}^k\}$ such that $\sum_k p_k = 1$. Define $\rho_A = \sum_k p_k \rho_A^k$ and $\rho'_{ABO} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_k p_k \rho_{AB}^k \otimes |k\rangle\langle k|_O$. Let a map $\mathcal{A}(X) = \sum_k P_k X P_k \otimes |k\rangle\langle k|_O$ be such that $P_k = \sqrt{p_k} \sqrt{\rho_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_A^k \rho_A^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$. Then it holds that*

$$F(\mathcal{A}(\rho_{AB}), \rho'_{ABO}) \geq \left(1 - \sum_{k \neq k'} \sqrt{p_k p_{k'}} F(\rho_A^k, \rho_A^{k'}) \right)^{3/2}.$$

Proof. Fact 11 ensures that

$$F(\mathcal{A}(\rho_{AB}), \rho'_{ABO}) \geq \left(\sum_k p_k \text{Tr}(P_k^2 \rho_{AB}^k) \right) = \left(\sum_k p_k^2 \text{Tr}(\rho_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_A^k \rho_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_A^k) \right)^{3/2},$$

where last equality follows since P_k act only on register A . Combining with Fact 12, we obtain the result. □

Fact 14 ([24]). *Let ρ, σ be quantum states such that $P(\rho, \sigma) \leq \varepsilon$. Let $0 \leq \Pi \leq I$ be an operator such that $\text{Tr}(\Pi \rho) \geq 1 - \delta^2$. Then $\text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma) \geq 1 - (2\varepsilon + \delta)^2$. If $\delta = 0$, then $\text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2$.*

Proof. Using monotonicity of fidelity under quantum operations, we obtain that

$$\sqrt{\text{Tr}(\Pi \rho) \text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma)} + \sqrt{(1 - \text{Tr}(\Pi \rho))(1 - \text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma))} \geq F(\rho, \sigma) \geq \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}.$$

Now,

$$\sqrt{\text{Tr}(\Pi \rho) \text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma)} + \sqrt{(1 - \text{Tr}(\Pi \rho))(1 - \text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma))} \leq \sqrt{\text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma)} + \sqrt{\delta(1 - \text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma))}.$$

We set $\text{Tr}(\Pi \sigma) = 1 - \kappa^2$ and obtain

$$\sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2} \leq \sqrt{1 - \kappa^2} + \kappa \cdot \delta \implies \frac{\kappa^2 - \varepsilon^2}{2} \leq \sqrt{\kappa} \delta.$$

This is satisfied as long as $\kappa \leq 2\varepsilon + \delta$. This proves the fact. The case $\delta = 0$ follows similarly. □

3 Classical state redistribution

Task: There are three parties: Reference, Alice and Bob. Reference possesses the random variable R , Alice possesses the random variables (A, C) and Bob possesses the random variable B . Alice wants to communicate her random variable C to Bob. To accomplish the task of communicating the random variable C to Bob, Alice sends a message M to Bob. Bob on receiving the message M constructs the random variable C' such that $\|RABC - RABC'\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$.

We define the following quantity

$$\text{Opt}^\varepsilon(RABC) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\substack{V: RB-AC-V, RA-BV-C' \\ \text{and } \|RBAC-RBAC'\|_1 \leq \varepsilon}} (\text{D}_s^\varepsilon(AC'V \| AC' \otimes V) - \text{D}_H^\varepsilon(BV \| B \otimes V)).$$

We prove the following results:

Theorem 1. (Achievability) Let $RABC$ be quadruplet of random variables taking values in $\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{B}$ and let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ be given. Let $\ell = \text{Opt}^\varepsilon(RABC) + 2 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. There exists a shared randomness assisted protocol communicating ℓ bits such that Bob outputs a random variable C'' satisfying $\|RABC - RABC''\|_1 \leq 7\varepsilon$.

Proof. Let V, C' be the random variables achieving the infimum in the definition of $\text{Opt}^\varepsilon(RABC)$. The main ingredient for the proof is Lemma 2. We now invoke Lemma 2 with $AC \leftarrow X$, $B \leftarrow Y$ and $V \leftarrow M$ to generate a random variable V' at Charlie's end such that

$$\|ACBV - ACBV'\|_1 \leq 6\varepsilon. \quad (1)$$

Bob on getting the random variables pair (V', B) generates a random variable C'' , as guaranteed by the relation $RA - BV - C'$. We will now show that $\|RABC - RABC''\|_1 \leq 6\varepsilon$. Towards this notice the following set of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} 6\varepsilon &\stackrel{a}{\geq} \|ACVB - ACBV'\|_1 \\ &\stackrel{b}{=} \|RACVB - RACBV'\|_1 \\ &\stackrel{c}{=} \|RACVBC' - RACBV'C''\|_1 \\ &\stackrel{d}{\geq} \|RABC' - RABC''\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

where a follows from (1) and the relation $\|AC - AC'\| \leq \varepsilon$, b follows because $R - ABC - V$ and $R - ABC - V'$, c and d follow from the monotonicity property of the distance between two distributions. The proof now follows by using the relation $\|RBAC - RBAC'\| \leq \varepsilon$. $\square$

Theorem 2. (Converse) In any one-way communication protocol for the task, the number of bits communicated is at least $\text{Opt}^\varepsilon(RABC) - \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$.

Proof. In any one-way communication protocol for this task with a shared randomness S , Alice produces a message V using ACS , and communicates the message to Bob. Thus, communication cost is $|V|$. Using the message V , and random variables B, S , Bob produces a random variable C' . By correctness of the protocol, we have that $\|RACB - RAC'B\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$. Using Fact 4, we conclude that $\text{D}_s^\varepsilon(AC'V \| AC' \otimes V) \leq \text{D}_s^\varepsilon(AC'SV \| AC'S \otimes V) \leq |V| + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. Thus the item follows. $\square$

4 Optimality of Braverman-Rao protocol and equivalent formulations

Consider the following setting. There are two parties Alice and Bob: Alice possesses the random variable (XM) and Bob possesses the random variable Y . Furthermore let us assume that $Y - X - M$. Alice wants to communicate the random variable M to Bob. To accomplish this task Alice sends a message to Bob. Bob on receiving these bits constructs a random variable M' such that $\|XYM - XYM'\|_1$ is small.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be any shared randomness assisted communication protocol in which Alice and Bob work on input XY , and Bob outputs a distribution M' correlated with XY . Let $\mathcal{P}(XY) := XYM'$ represent the resulting output distribution. We define $\text{err}(\mathcal{P}) := \|\mathcal{P}(XY) - XYM\|_1$ as the error incurred by the protocol and $C(\mathcal{P})$ as the communication cost of the protocol.

Our main result is the following theorem, which gives the near optimality of the protocol given due to Braverman and Rao [10]. In addition, we also give a new protocol using extensions of the random variable XYM . In this direction, we define the two main quantities below: BR^ε (which captures the worst case communication cost of the Braverman-Rao protocol, and we refer to it as the Braverman-Rao quantity) and Ext^ε (which captures the worst case communication cost of the protocol that uses extensions of the input).

Theorem 3. *Consider joint random variables (X, Y, M) such that $Y - X - M$ holds. Define the following three quantities associated to these random variables.*

- Opt^ε : $\min_{\mathcal{P}: \text{err}(\mathcal{P}) \leq \varepsilon} C(\mathcal{P})$.
- Opt_1^ε : $\min_{XYUSM'} D_\infty(XSV \| XS \otimes U)$, such that S is independent of XY , $Y - XS - V$ and $X - YVS - M'$ and $\|XYM' - XYM\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$. Here U is the uniformly distributed random variable.
- BR^ε : $\min_{X'Y'M': Y'-X'-M' \text{ and } \|X'Y'M' - XYM\|_1 \leq \varepsilon} \max_{y \in \text{supp}(Y')} \inf_{N_y} D_s^\varepsilon(X'M'_y \| X'_y \otimes N_y)$
- Ext^ε : $\min_{X'Y'M'E: Y'-X'-M'E \text{ and } \|X'Y'M' - XYM\|_1 \leq \varepsilon} (D_s^\varepsilon(X'M'E \| X' \otimes U) - D_H^\varepsilon(Y'M'E \| Y' \otimes U))$, where U is random variable distributed according to uniform distribution.

It holds that

1. $\text{Opt}^\varepsilon \geq \text{Opt}_1^\varepsilon$.
2. $\text{Opt}_1^\varepsilon \geq \text{BR}^{3\sqrt{\varepsilon}} - \log(\frac{4}{\varepsilon})$.
3. $\text{BR}^\varepsilon + \log(\frac{2}{\varepsilon}) \geq \text{Opt}^{6\varepsilon}$.
4. $\text{Ext}^\varepsilon + 2\log(\frac{2}{\varepsilon}) + 2\log \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \geq \text{Opt}^{4\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$
5. $\text{BR}^\varepsilon > \text{Ext}^\varepsilon$.

Proof. We will prove the results in sequence.

1. In any one-way communication protocol with a shared randomness S , Alice produces a message V using XS , and communicates the message to Bob. Thus, communication cost is $|V|$. Using the message V , shared randomness S and his input Y , Bob produces a register M' . By correctness of the protocol, we have that $\|XYM' - XYM\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$. Since $D_\infty(XSV \| XS \otimes U) \leq |V|$, this item follows.
2. Given the distribution XYM' , we recall that $\|XYM' - XYM\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$. This can be re-written as $\sum_y \Pr_Y(y) \|XM'_y - XM_y\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$. By Markov inequality, probability that $\|XM'_y - XM_y\|_1 > \sqrt{\varepsilon}$ is less than $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. Let all such y be in the set Bad and rest of y be in the set Good . Then for all $y \in \text{Good}$ we have that $\mathbb{E}_{x \leftarrow X_y} \|M'_{xy} - M_x\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$. Now, we construct a new random variable $X_1Y_1M_1$ as follows. We set $\Pr_{X_1Y_1M_1}(x, y, m) = \frac{\Pr_Y(y)}{\sum_{y \notin \text{Bad}} \Pr_Y(y)} \Pr_{XM'}(xm|y)$ if y is not in Bad . Else we set it 0. Then we construct the random variable $X'Y'M''$ as $\Pr_{X'Y'M''}(x, y, m) = \Pr_{X_1Y_1}(x, y) \cdot \Pr_M(m|x)$. Following properties are satisfied by these random variables.

- (a) $\text{supp}(Y_1) = \text{supp}(Y') = \text{Good}$.
- (b) $X_1 Y_1 \sim X' Y'$ and for all $y \in \text{Good}$, $X'_y \sim (X_1)_y \sim X_y$.
- (c) It holds that $Y' - X' - M''$.
- (d) For all $y \in \text{Good}$,

$$\|X' M''_y - X M'_y\|_1 = \mathbb{E}_{x \leftarrow X'_y} \|M''_{xy} - M'_{xy}\|_1 = \mathbb{E}_{x \leftarrow X'_y} \|M_x - M'_{xy}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

- (e) Using the fact that $\|X_1 Y_1 M_1 - X Y M\|_1 \leq 2 \Pr_Y(\text{Bad}) \leq 2\sqrt{\varepsilon}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|X' Y' M'' - X Y M\|_1 &\leq \|X' Y' M'' - X_1 Y_1 M_1\|_1 + \|X_1 Y_1 M_1 - X Y M\|_1 \leq \\ &\max_{y \in \text{Good}} \mathbb{E}_{y \leftarrow X'_y} \|M''_x - (M_1)_{xy}\|_1 + 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} = \max_{y \in \text{Good}} \mathbb{E}_{y \leftarrow X'_y} \|M_x - M'_{xy}\|_1 + 2\sqrt{\varepsilon} \leq 3\sqrt{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we proceed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} D_\infty(XSV \| X \otimes S \otimes \mu) &\stackrel{b}{=} D_\infty(YXSV \| YX \otimes S \otimes U) \\ &= \max_{y \in \text{supp}(Y)} D_\infty(XSV_y \| X_y \otimes S_y \otimes U) \\ &\stackrel{c}{\geq} \max_{y \in \text{supp}(Y)} \min_{S'V'} D_\infty(XSV_y \| X_y \otimes S'V') \\ &\stackrel{d}{\geq} \max_{y \in \text{supp}(Y)} \min_{N_y} D_\infty(XM'_y \| X_y \otimes N_y) \\ &\stackrel{e}{\geq} \max_{y \in \text{supp}(Y_1)} \min_{N_y} D_\infty^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(X'M''_y \| X_y \otimes N_y) \\ &\stackrel{f}{=} \max_{y \in \text{supp}(Y_1)} \min_{N_y} D_\infty^{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(X'M''_y \| X'_y \otimes N_y) \\ &\stackrel{g}{\geq} \max_{y \in \text{supp}(Y')} \min_{N_y} D_s^{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(X'M''_y \| X'_y \otimes N_y) - \log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Above, (b) follows from the fact that $Y - X - SV$, (c) follows by minimizing over all random variables $S'V'$, (d) follows from the fact that conditioned on y , Bob produces the random variable M' independent of X , (e) follows from the fact that for all $y \in \text{supp}(Y_1)$, we have that $\|X'M''_y - XM'_y\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\varepsilon}$, (f) follows from Property 2 listed above and (g) follows from Fact 5.

Now, recall from Property 3 above that $Y' - X' - M''$. Since $\|X'Y'M'' - XYM\|_1 \leq 3\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ (Property 5), we find that

$$\max_{y \in \text{supp}(Y')} \min_{N_y} D_s^{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(X'M''_y \| X'_y \otimes N_y) \geq \max_{y \in \text{supp}(Y')} \min_{N_y} D_s^{3\sqrt{\varepsilon}}(X'M''_y \| X'_y \otimes N_y) \geq \text{BR}^{3\sqrt{\varepsilon}}.$$

This proves the item.

3. Consider a distribution $X'Y'M'$, along with the distributions N_y (for all $y \in \text{supp}(Y')$), that achieves the minimum in BR^ε . Recall that $Y' - X' - M'$ holds, which implies that the expression for BR^ε is as follows.

$$\text{BR}^\varepsilon = \max_{y \in \text{supp}(Y')} \inf(a_y : \Pr_{x, m \leftarrow X'M'_y} \left(\frac{\Pr_{M'_y}(m|x)}{\Pr_{N_y}(m)} > 2^{a_y} \right) \leq \varepsilon).$$

Alice and Bob start with the distribution $X'Y'$, Alice has knowledge of the distribution M'_x , Bob has the knowledge of N_y and both parties know the value of BR^ε . Both run the protocol $\mathcal{Q}$ as defined in Corollary 1 with the value of $c = \text{BR}^\varepsilon$. Let the random variable output by $\mathcal{Q}$ be $X'Y'M''$. By

definition of BR^ε , we have that for all $y \in \text{supp}(Y')$, $\Pr_{x \leftarrow X'_y}(\text{D}_s^\varepsilon(M_x \| N_y) > \text{BR}^\varepsilon) \leq \varepsilon$. Thus for all $y \in \text{supp}(Y')$, with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$ according to X'_y , it holds that $\|M''_{xy} - M'_x\|_1 \leq 3\varepsilon$. This implies that $\|X'Y'M'' - X'Y'M'\|_1 \leq 4\varepsilon$. In other words, $\|\mathcal{Q}(X'Y') - X'Y'M'\|_1 \leq 4\varepsilon$. Since $\|X'Y' - XY\|_1 \leq \|X'Y'M' - XYM\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ is a protocol, it holds that

$$\|\mathcal{Q}(XY) - XYM\|_1 \leq \|\mathcal{Q}(XY) - \mathcal{Q}(X'Y')\|_1 + \|\mathcal{Q}(X'Y') - X'Y'M'\|_1 + \|X'Y'M' - XYM\|_1 \leq \varepsilon + 4\varepsilon + \varepsilon.$$

The communication cost is $\text{BR}^\varepsilon + \log(\frac{2}{\varepsilon})$. This completes the proof.

4. As shown in Lemma 2, for any distribution $X'Y'M'E'$ such that $Y' - X' - M'E'$, there exists a protocol $\mathcal{P}$ with $\|\mathcal{P}(X'Y'M') - X'Y'M'\|_1 \leq 3\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ and communication cost

$$\text{D}_s^\varepsilon(X'M'E' \| X' \otimes U) - \text{D}_H^\varepsilon(Y'M'E' \| Y' \otimes U) + 2 \log \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}.$$

Thus, choosing $X'Y'M'$ such that $\|X'Y'M' - XYM\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$, we have that $\|\mathcal{P}(XYM) - XYM\|_1 \leq 4\sqrt{\varepsilon}$. This proves the item.

5. Let $X'Y'M'$ and the distributions N_y be as obtained from the definition of BR^ε . From Theorem 4 in Section 4, it holds that there exists a random variable E such that $X'Y'M'E$ satisfies $Y' - X' - M'E$ and

$$\max_y \text{D}_\infty^\varepsilon(X'M'_y \| X'_y \otimes N_y) \geq \text{D}_s^\varepsilon(X'M'E \| X' \otimes U) - \text{D}_H^\varepsilon(Y'M'E \| Y' \otimes U).$$

The item follows by observing that Ext^ε is obtained by minimizing right hand side over all $X'Y'M'E$ and U , such that $Y' - X' - M'E$ and $\|X'Y'M' - XYM\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$.

□

A new protocol using extensions

In this section, we construct a new communication protocol for sending a random variable from Alice to Bob. We consider the following scenario. Alice possesses the random variable (XME) (with M, E taking values on the sets $\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{E}$ respectively) and Bob possesses the random variable Y . Furthermore let us assume that $Y - X - ME$. Alice wants to communicate the random variable ME to Bob. To accomplish this task Alice sends a message to Bob. Bob on receiving the message constructs a pair of random variables (M', E') such that $\|XYME - XYM'E'\|_1$ is small. The following lemma makes the above statement more precise.

Lemma 2. (Achievability) *Let $XYME$ be as defined above. Further, let U be a uniformly distributed over the set $\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ and be independent of $XYME$. Let R and r be such that*

Then there exists a shared randomness assisted communication protocol in which Bob outputs random variable pair (M', E') satisfying $\|XYME - XYM'E'\|_1 \leq 6\varepsilon$.

In particular, the communication cost of the protocol is upper bounded by

$$\text{D}_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U) - \text{D}_H^\varepsilon(YME \| Y \otimes U) + 2 \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. Define R, r as follows.

$$R + r = \text{D}_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U) + \log \left(\frac{-\ln(\varepsilon)}{(1 - \varepsilon)} \right); \quad (2)$$

$$r = \text{D}_H^\varepsilon(YME \| Y \otimes U) + \log \left(\frac{\varepsilon(1 - \varepsilon)}{-\ln(\varepsilon)} \right) \quad (\text{if } \text{D}_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U) > 1); \quad (3)$$

$$r = 0 \quad (\text{if } \text{D}_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U) \leq 1) \quad (4)$$

Let U be as in the lemma, let Z be uniformly distributed over the set $[0, 1]$. Also, let $b : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{U} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be defined by $b(x, m, e, z) = 1$ iff $z \leq \min(2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)}, 1)$. Let $B = b(X \otimes U \otimes Z)$ be the corresponding random variable. We now make the following claims which are easy to prove and will help us to prove the claim of the lemma:

Claim 1. $\Pr_B(1 \mid X \otimes U = (x, m, e)) = \min(2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)}, 1)$

Proof. It follows by direct calculation. $\square$

Claim 2. *It holds that*

$$2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \geq \Pr_B(1|x) \geq 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \Pr_{(m,e) \leftarrow ME_x} \left(\frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)} < 2^{D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \right).$$

In particular,

$$2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \geq \Pr_B(1) \geq 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} (1 - \varepsilon).$$

Proof. We proceed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_B(1|x) &= \sum_{m,e} \Pr_U(m, e) \Pr_B(1 \mid X \otimes U = (x, m, e)) \\ &= \sum_{m,e} \Pr_U(m, e) \min(2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)}, 1) \geq \\ &= 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \sum_{m,e} \Pr_{ME}(m, e|x) \text{IND}(2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)} < 1) \end{aligned}$$

where IND is the indicator function. Thus,

$$\Pr_B(1|x) \geq 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \Pr_{(m,e) \leftarrow ME_x} \left(\frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)} < 2^{D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \right).$$

This also leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_B(1) &\geq 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \sum_x P_X(x) \Pr_{(m,e) \leftarrow ME_x} \left(\frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)} < 2^{D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \right) \\ &= 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \Pr_{(x,m,e) \leftarrow XME} \left(\frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)} < 2^{D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \right) \geq 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} (1 - \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

For the upper bound, we proceed as

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_B(1|x) &= \sum_{m,e} \Pr_U(m, e) \min(2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)}, 1) \\ &\leq \sum_{m,e} \Pr_U(m, e) \cdot 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)} \\ &= 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \sum_{m,e} \Pr_{ME}(m, e|x) = 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Claim 3. $\Pr_{X \otimes U}(x, m, e \mid B = 1) \leq \Pr_{XME}(x, m, e)/(1 - \varepsilon)$. In particular, let YXU_1 be the random variable $YX \otimes U$ conditioned on the event $B = 1$. Then

$$\|YXU_1 - YXME\|_1 \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Using Bayes' theorem and Claims 1 and 2, $\Pr_{X \otimes U}(x, m, e \mid B = 1)$ can be written as

$$\frac{\Pr_B(1 \mid X \otimes U = (x, m, e)) \cdot \Pr_{X \otimes U}(x, m, e)}{\Pr_B(1)} \leq \frac{\min(\Pr_{XME}(x, m, e), 2^{D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U)} \cdot \Pr_U(m, e) \Pr_X(x))}{1 - \varepsilon}.$$

First part of the claim follows since $\min(a, b) \leq a$.

For second part, we observe that $Y - X - U_1$ holds, as the event $B = 1$ is defined conditioned on x . Also recall that $Y - X - ME$. Thus, $\|YXU_1 - YXME\|_1 \leq \|XU_1 - XME\|_1$. Second part follows as first part of the claim implies that $\|XU_1 - XME\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$. $\square$

Suppose Alice and Bob share $T = \{(U(1), Z(1)), (U(2), Z(2)), \dots, (U(2^{R+r}), Z(2^{R+r}))\}$ of 2^{R+r} i.i.d. pairs each with distribution (U, Z) . Further, let us divide these 2^{R+r} shared copies of (U, Z) into 2^R bands each having 2^r copies of (U, Z) . This subdivision of T is known to both Alice and Bob. Further, for $i \in [1 : 2^{R+r}]$ let $B(i)$ be the analogous random variable (as defined above).

We now discuss the protocol which ensures the statement of the lemma. Alice on receiving $(x, m, e) \leftarrow XME$ tries to find the first i^* such that $B(i) = 1$. Alice then conveys the band number $\text{Band}(i^*)$ of this index to Bob. Bob on receiving the band number $\text{Band}(i^*)$ tries to infer the correct i^* . We will now show that Bob is indeed able to infer the correct i^* with high probability. We will then further show that our protocol will accomplish the task as claimed in the lemma. Towards this let $\mathcal{A}$ be such that

$$\Pr_{YME}(\mathcal{A}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

and

$$D_H^\varepsilon(YME \| Y \otimes U) = -\log \Pr_{Y \otimes U}(\mathcal{A}).$$

The decoding strategy is simply that Bob on receiving Y and the band number $\text{Band}(i^*)$, tries to find a unique $\hat{i} \in \text{Band}(i^*)$ such that $(U(\hat{i}), Y) \in \mathcal{A}$. To find the error probability with respect to this decoding strategy by Bob let us define the following events

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1 &= \{\forall i \in [1 : 2^{R+r}] : B(i) = 0\}; \\ \mathcal{E}_2 &= \{(U(i^*), Y) \notin \mathcal{A}\}; \\ \mathcal{E}_3 &= \{(U(i'), Y) \in \mathcal{A} \text{ for some } i' \neq i^*\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\hat{i}$ be the decoded index and let $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$ be the event that $\hat{i} \neq i^*$. We now bound the overall error probability of the protocol as follows:

$$\Pr\{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}\} \leq \Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1\} + \Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_2\} + \Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_3\}, \quad (5)$$

where the probability is computed over all the randomness in the protocol.

We now calculate each of the terms on the R.H.S of 5. Our strategy is to bound each of the error

conditioned on x and then average over x . For the first error, we proceed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1\} &= \sum_x \Pr_X(x) \Pr[B(i) = 0, \forall i \in [1 : 2^{R+r}] | x] \\ &= \sum_x \Pr_X(x) \left(1 - \Pr_B(1|x)\right)^{2^{R+r}} \stackrel{a}{\leq} \sum_x \Pr_X(x) e^{-\Pr_B(1|x) 2^{R+r}} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\stackrel{b}{\leq} \sum_x \Pr_X(x) \left(1 - \Pr_{(m,e) \leftarrow ME_x} \left(\frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)} < 2^{D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U)} \right)\right) + e^{-2^{R+r} 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U)}} \quad (7)$$

$$\leq 1 - \Pr_{XME} \left(\frac{\Pr_{ME}(m, e|x)}{\Pr_U(m, e)} < 2^{D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U)} \right) + 2\varepsilon \leq 3\varepsilon. \quad (8)$$

where (a) and (b) follow from Fact 3 and last inequality follows from our choice of $R + r$ and definition of $D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U)$.

Consider $\Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_2\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_2\} &\leq \Pr\{\mathcal{E}_2 \mid \mathcal{E}_1^c\} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \Pr_X(x) \sum_{(m,e,y) \notin \mathcal{A}} \Pr_{U(i^*)} \{m, e \mid B(i^*) = 1, x\} \Pr_Y(y \mid x, m, e, B(i^*) = 1) \\ &\stackrel{a}{\leq} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{(m,y) \notin \mathcal{A}} \frac{\Pr_{XME}(x, m, e)}{1 - \varepsilon} \Pr_Y(y \mid x) \\ &\stackrel{b}{=} \sum_{(m,e,y) \notin \mathcal{A}} \frac{\Pr_{MEY}(m, e, y)}{1 - \varepsilon} \stackrel{c}{\leq} \frac{\varepsilon}{(1 - \varepsilon)}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where a follows from Claim 3 and the fact that conditioned on x , Y_x is independent of $U(i^*)$, b follows because $Y - X - ME$ and c follows from the definitions of the set $\mathcal{A}$.

Consider $\Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_3\}$. If $D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U) \leq 1$, then this event is empty, as the size of each band is 1. So we assume that $D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U) > 1$ and proceed as follows.

Fix an x and let $\bar{U}_x(i')$ (for $i' < i^*$) be the distribution over U conditioned on $B(i') = 0$. From Fact 2 and the fact that $U(i')$ and X are independent of each other before the event $B(i') = 0$, we have

$$\Pr_{\bar{U}_x(i')} (m, e) \leq \frac{\Pr_{U(i')}(m, e)}{\Pr_B(0|x)} \leq \frac{\Pr_{U(i')}(m, e)}{1 - 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U)}},$$

where last inequality follows from Claim 2.

On the other hand, for $i' > i^*$, the distribution on $U(i')$ remains unchanged. Thus, we can use union bound, and upper bound $\Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_3\}$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_3\} &\leq \frac{2^r}{1 - 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U)}} \sum_x \Pr_X(x) \sum_{y, m, e \in \mathcal{A}} \Pr_U(m, e) \cdot \Pr_Y(y|x) \\ &= \frac{2^r}{1 - 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U)}} \sum_{y, m, e \in \mathcal{A}} \Pr_U(m, e) \cdot \sum_x \Pr_X(x) \Pr_Y(y|x) \\ &= \frac{2^r}{1 - 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U)}} \sum_{y, m, e \in \mathcal{A}} \Pr_U(m, e) \Pr_Y(y) \\ &\leq \frac{2^r}{1 - 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME \| X \otimes U)}} \cdot 2^{-D_H^\varepsilon(YME \| Y \otimes U)} \end{aligned}$$

In the first inequality, we have divided the expression by $1 - 2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)}$ to include the upper bound that may hold for the distribution $\tilde{U}_x(i')$.

By our assumption, $D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U) > 1$ implies $2^{-D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U)} \leq 1/2$. Thus, we find that $\Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_3\} \leq 2 \cdot 2^{r-D_H^\varepsilon(YME\|Y \otimes U)-\log(1-\varepsilon)} \leq 2\varepsilon$ for the choice of r . Collectively, we find that

$$\Pr\{\tilde{\mathcal{E}}\} \leq \Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1\} + \Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_2\} + \Pr\{\mathcal{E}_1^c \cap \mathcal{E}_3\} \leq 3\varepsilon + 3\varepsilon \leq 6\varepsilon.$$

To conclude the proof, we need to upper bound $\|XYM'E' - XYME\|_1$. We note that conditioned on the event that Bob outputs from index i^* , Claim 3 ensures that $\|XYU_{B(i^*)=1} - XYME\|_1 \leq \varepsilon$. Since probability that the index output is not i^* is equal to $\Pr\{\hat{\mathcal{E}}\} \leq 5\varepsilon$, we conclude that the final output $XYM'E'$ satisfies $\|XYM'E' - XYME\|_1 \leq 6\varepsilon$. The communication cost of the protocol is equal to R . In both the cases of $D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U) \leq 1$ and $D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U) > 1$, the upper bound

$$R \leq D_s^\varepsilon(XME\|X \otimes U) - D_H^\varepsilon(YME\|Y \otimes U) + 2 \log \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$$

is easily seen to hold. This completes the proof. $\square$

Relating Braverman-Rao quantity and extension quantity

Recall the quantity BR^ε as defined in Theorem 3. Let $X'Y'M'$ be the optimal Markov chain and N_y (for all $y \in \text{supp}(Y')$) be the set of distributions from the definition. We will define an extension $X'Y'M'E$ such that $Y' - X' - M'E$ holds. Towards this let $\mathcal{P} = \{(x, m) : P_{M'}(m | x) > 0\}$. Let K be the smallest integer such that $K \cdot P_{M'}(m|x)$ is an integer. This can be assumed to hold with arbitrarily small error. Further, let E be a random variable taking values over the set $\mathcal{K} := \{1, \dots, K\}$ and defined as follows. For every $(m, e, x) \in \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{K} \otimes \mathcal{X}$ we have

$$\Pr_{M'E}(e, m, x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\Pr_{X'}(x)}{K} & \text{if } e \leq K \Pr_{M|X}(m | x), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

It is easy to see that the property $Y' - X' - M'E$ holds. Let U be a uniform random variable distributed over the set $\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{K}$. We now have the following theorem.

Theorem 4. Consider $Y' - X' - M'$, $\{N_y\}_y$ and (E, U) be as defined above. Then,

$$\max_y D_s^\varepsilon(X'M'_y\|X'_y \otimes N_y) \geq D_s^\varepsilon(X'M'E\|X' \otimes U) - D_H^\varepsilon(Y'M'E\|Y \otimes U).$$

Proof. Let us first calculate $D_\infty(X'M'E\|X' \otimes U)$. Towards this notice the following set of inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} D_s(X'M'E\|X' \otimes U) &\stackrel{a}{=} \max_{m,x,e} \log \frac{\Pr_{X'M'E}(x, m, e)}{\Pr_{X'}(x) \Pr_U(u)} \\ &\stackrel{b}{=} \log \frac{|\mathcal{M}|K}{K} \\ &= \log |\mathcal{M}|, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where a follows from the definition of $D_s(X'M'E\|X' \otimes U)$; b follows from (10) and the fact that U is uniform over the set $\mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{K}$. Let us define the following set

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ (y, m, e) \in \mathcal{Y} \otimes \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{K} : e \leq K 2^{\max_{y'} D_s^\varepsilon(X'M'_{y'}\|X'_{y'} \otimes N_{y'})} \Pr_{N_y}(m) \right\}. \quad (12)$$

We will prove the following

$$\Pr_{Y'U} \{\mathcal{A}\} = 2^{-(\log |\mathcal{M}| - \max_y D_s^\varepsilon(X' M'_y \| X'_y \otimes N_y))}, \quad (13)$$

$$\Pr_{M'Y'E} \{\mathcal{A}\} \geq 1 - \varepsilon. \quad (14)$$

The theorem now follows since by definition of $D_H^\varepsilon(Y' M' E \| Y' \otimes U)$ and equation 11,

$$\begin{aligned} D_H^\varepsilon(Y' M' E \| Y' \otimes U) &\geq \log |\mathcal{M}| - \max_y D_s^\varepsilon(X' M'_y \| X'_y \otimes M'_y) \\ &= D_s(X' M' E \| X' \otimes U) - \max_y D_s^\varepsilon(X' M'_y \| X'_y \otimes N_y). \end{aligned}$$

Let us first prove (13). Towards this notice the following

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{Y'U} \{\mathcal{A}\} &= \sum_{(y,m,e) \in \mathcal{A}} \Pr_{Y'}(y) \Pr_U(m, e) \\ &= \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \Pr_{Y'}(y) \sum_{(m,e): (y,m,e) \in \mathcal{A}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}|K} \\ &= \sum_{(y,m) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{M}} \Pr_{Y'}(y) \Pr_{N_y}(m) \frac{K 2^{\max_{y'} D_s^\varepsilon(X' M'_{y'} \| X'_{y'} \otimes N_{y'})}}{|\mathcal{M}|K} \\ &= \frac{2^{\max_{y'} D_s^\varepsilon(X' M'_{y'} \| X'_{y'} \otimes N_{y'})}}{|\mathcal{M}|} \\ &= 2^{-(\log |\mathcal{M}| - \max_{y'} D_s^\varepsilon(X' M'_{y'} \| X'_{y'} \otimes N_{y'}))}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof for (13). Let us now prove the claim in (14). Towards this we have the following set of inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{Y' M' E} \{\mathcal{A}\} &= \sum_x \Pr_{X'}(x) \sum_{(y,m,e) \in \mathcal{A}} \Pr_{Y'}(y | x) \Pr_{M'E}(me | x) \\ &\stackrel{a}{=} \sum_x \Pr_{X'}(x) \sum_y \Pr_{Y'}(y | x) \sum_m \sum_{e: e \leq K \Pr_{M'}(m|x)} \frac{1}{K} \\ &\stackrel{b}{\geq} \sum_{(x,y)} \Pr_{X'Y'}(x, y) \sum_{m: \Pr_{M'}(m|x) \leq 2^{\max_{y'} D_s^\varepsilon(X' M'_{y'} \| X'_{y'} \otimes N_{y'})} \Pr_{N_y}(m)} \Pr_{M'}(m | x) \\ &= \Pr_{(y,x,m) \leftarrow Y' X' M'} \left\{ \Pr_{M'}(m|x) \leq 2^{\max_{y'} D_s^\varepsilon(X' M'_{y'} \| X'_{y'} \otimes N_{y'})} \Pr_{N_y}(m) \right\} \\ &\stackrel{c}{\geq} 1 - \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where a follows from (10), b follows if we restrict to m such that

$$\Pr_{M'}(m|x) \leq 2^{\max_{y'} D_s^\varepsilon(X' M'_{y'} \| X'_{y'} \otimes N_{y'})} \Pr_{N_y}(m),$$

as for such m and e such that $e \leq K \Pr_{M'}(m|x)$, (y, m, e) automatically belongs to the set $\mathcal{A}$. The step c follows from the definition of $\max_{y'} D_s^\varepsilon(X' M'_{y'} \| X'_{y'} \otimes N_{y'})$. This completes the proof. $\square$

5 An achievability bound on quantum state redistribution

Following lemma was shown in [9], which the authors refer to as *convex-split lemma*.

Lemma 3 (Convex-split lemma). *[[9]] Let $\rho_{PQ} \in \mathcal{D}(PQ)$ and $\sigma_Q \in \mathcal{D}(Q)$ be quantum states such that $\text{supp}(\rho_Q) \subset \text{supp}(\sigma_Q)$. Let $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{\max}(\rho_{PQ} \| \rho_P \otimes \sigma_Q)$. Define the following state*

$$\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\dots Q_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j+1}} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}$$

on $n+1$ registers $P, Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_n$, where $\forall j \in [n] : \rho_{PQ_j} = \rho_{PQ}$ and $\sigma_{Q_j} = \sigma_Q$. Then,

$$D(\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\dots Q_n} \| \tau_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}) \leq \log(1 + \frac{2^k}{n})$$

and

$$F^2(\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\dots Q_n}, \tau_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}) \geq \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2^k}{n}}.$$

In particular, for $\delta \in (0, 1/3)$ and $n = \lceil \frac{2^k}{\delta} \rceil$,

$$D(\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\dots Q_n} \| \tau_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}) \leq \log(1 + \delta)$$

and

$$F^2(\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\dots Q_n}, \tau_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Using this lemma, the authors showed the following result, which says that given a quantum state $\Phi_{RA'B'M}$ shared between Alice (registers $A'M$), Bob (register B') and Referee (register R), the message M can be sent from Alice to Bob with communication cost close to $I_{\max}(RB' : M)_{\Phi}$.

Theorem 5 ([9]). *There exists an entanglement-assisted one-way protocol $\mathcal{P}$, which takes as input $|\Phi\rangle_{RA'MB'}$ shared between three parties Referee (R), Bob (B') and Alice ($A'M$) and outputs a state $\Phi'_{RA'MB'}$ shared between Referee (R), Bob ($B'M$) and Alice (A') such that $\Phi'_{RA'MB'} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_{RA'MB'})$ and the number of qubits communicated by Alice to Bob in $\mathcal{P}$ is upper bounded by:*

$$\frac{1}{2} I_{\max}(RB' : M)_{\Phi} + \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

In this section, we improve upon this theorem, showing that further compression is possible. We use this to derive a new achievability bound on the task of quantum state redistribution, to be discussed later in this section.

New compression result

To prove our new compression result, we will make use of a simple corollary of convex split lemma, also used in [24].

Corollary 2 (Corollary of convex-split lemma, [24]). *Let $\rho_{PQ} \in \mathcal{D}(PQ)$ and $\sigma_Q \in \mathcal{D}(Q)$ be quantum states such that $\text{supp}(\rho_Q) \subset \text{supp}(\sigma_Q)$. Let $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\rho'_{PQ} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\rho_{PQ})} D_{\max}(\rho'_{PQ} \| \rho'_P \otimes \sigma_Q)$. Define the following state*

$$\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\dots Q_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j+1}} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}$$

on $n+1$ registers $P, Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_n$, where $\forall j \in [n] : \rho_{PQ_j} = \rho_{PQ}$ and $\sigma_{Q_j} = \sigma_Q$. For $\delta \in (0, 1/3)$ and $n = \lceil \frac{2^k}{\delta} \rceil$, it holds that

$$F^2(\tau_{PQ_1Q_2\dots Q_n}, \tau_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}) \geq 1 - (\sqrt{\delta} + 2\varepsilon)^2.$$

Proof. Let ρ'_{PQ} be the state achieving the infimum in k . Consider the state

$$\tau'_{PQ_1Q_2\dots Q_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \rho'_{PQ_j} \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{Q_2} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{Q_{j+1}} \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}$$

From lemma 3, we have that $F^2(\tau'_{PQ_1Q_2\dots Q_n}, \rho'_P \otimes \sigma_{Q_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{Q_n}) \geq 1 - \delta$. Now, $F^2(\tau'_{PQ_1Q_2\dots Q_n}, \tau_{PQ_1Q_2\dots Q_n}) \geq F^2(\rho'_{PQ}, \rho_{PQ}) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2$ and similarly $F^2(\rho'_P, \rho_P) \geq 1 - \varepsilon^2$. The corollary now follows by triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 6). $\square$

We prove the following theorem.

Theorem 6 (Quantum compression). *Fix $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$. There exists an entanglement-assisted one-way protocol $\mathcal{P}$, which takes as input $|\Phi\rangle_{RA'MB'}$ shared between three parties Referee (R), Bob (B') and Alice ($A'M$) and outputs a state $\Phi'_{RA'MB'}$ shared between Referee (R), Bob ($B'M$) and Alice (A') such that $\Phi'_{RA'MB'} \in \mathcal{B}^{3\varepsilon_1 + 5\varepsilon_2}(\Psi_{RA'MB'})$ and the number of qubits communicated by Alice to Bob in $\mathcal{P}$ is upper bounded by:*

$$\frac{1}{2} \inf_{\sigma_M} \left(\inf_{\Phi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Phi)} D_{\max}(\Phi'_{RB'M} \| \Phi'_{RB'} \otimes \sigma_M) - \sup_{\Phi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Phi)} D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Phi''_{B'M} \| \Phi''_{B'} \otimes \sigma_M) \right) + \log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1 \cdot \varepsilon_2} \right).$$

Proof. The proof is similar in spirit to the proof of Theorem 5, except that the decoding operation at Bob's side is now made more non-trivial.

Let σ_M be an arbitrary state in $\mathcal{D}(M)$. Let $k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{\Phi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Phi)} D_{\max}(\Phi'_{RB'M} \| \Phi'_{RB'} \otimes \sigma_M)$, $\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \varepsilon_1^2$ and $n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lceil \frac{2^k}{\delta} \rceil$. For any $\Phi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Phi)$, let $b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lceil \varepsilon_2^2 \cdot 2^{\frac{1}{2} D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Phi''_{B'M} \| \Phi''_{B'} \otimes \sigma_M)} \rceil$.

Consider the state,

$$\mu_{RB'M_1\dots M_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \Phi_{RB'M_j} \otimes \sigma_{M_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{M_{j+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_n}.$$

Note that $\Phi_{RB'} = \mu_{RB'}$. Consider the following purification of $\mu_{RB'M_1\dots M_n}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mu\rangle_{RB'JL_1\dots L_nM_1\dots M_n} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n |j\rangle_J |\tilde{\Phi}\rangle_{RB'A'M_j} \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{L_1M_1} \otimes \dots \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{L_{j-1}M_{j-1}} \otimes |0\rangle_{L_j} \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{L_{j+1}M_{j+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{L_nM_n} \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\forall j \in [n] : |\sigma\rangle_{L_jM_j}$ is a purification of σ_{M_j} and $|\tilde{\Phi}\rangle_{RB'L_jM_j}$ is a purification of $\Phi_{RB'M_j}$. Consider the following protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$.

1. Alice, Bob and Referee start by sharing the state $|\mu\rangle_{RB'JL_1\dots L_nM_1\dots M_n}$ between themselves where Alice holds registers $JL_1\dots L_n$, Referee holds the register R and Bob holds the registers $B'M_1M_2\dots M_n$.
2. Alice measures the register J and obtains the measurement outcome $j \in [n]$. She sends the integer $\lfloor (j-1)/b \rfloor$ to Bob using $\frac{\log(n/b)}{2}$ qubits of quantum communication. Alice and Bob employ superdense coding ([26]) using fresh entanglement to achieve this.
3. Bob swaps registers $M_{b \cdot \lfloor (j-1)/b \rfloor + 1}, M_{b \cdot \lfloor (j-1)/b \rfloor + 2}, \dots, M_{b \cdot \lfloor (j-1)/b \rfloor + b}$ with the set of registers $M_1, M_2, \dots, M_b$ in that order.

- At this step of the protocol, the joint state in the registers $RB'A'M_1M_2 \dots M_b$ is

$$\mu_{RB'A'M_1M_2 \dots M_b}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{j=1}^b |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|_{RB'A'M_j} \otimes \sigma_{M_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{M_{j+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_b}.$$

- Bob performs the following quantum operation (which we label as $\mathcal{P}_B$). For brevity, set $\sigma^{-j} = \sigma_{M_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{M_{j+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_b}$ and recall that Φ'' is a state ε_2 -close to Φ .

- Initialize $k := 1$, $\rho_0 := \Phi''_{B'M_1} \otimes \sigma^{-1}$, $\rho^1 := \frac{1}{b-1} \sum_{j=2}^b \Phi''_{B'M_j} \otimes \sigma^{-j}$.
- While $k < b$, do:
 - Set $\rho := \frac{1}{b-k+1} \rho_0 + (1 - \frac{1}{b-k+1}) \rho_1$.
 - Define $\Pi_0 := \sqrt{\rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_0 \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$ and $\Pi_1 := \sqrt{\rho^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho_1 \rho^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$.
 - Apply the measurement $\mathcal{A}(X) := \frac{1}{b-k+1} \Pi_0 X \Pi_0 \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{O_k} + (1 - \frac{1}{b-k+1}) \Pi_1 X \Pi_1 \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_{O_k}$ on the registers $BM_1M_2 \dots M_b$ to produce an additional output register O_k .
 - If the outcome obtained in register O_k is $|0\rangle\langle 0|$, then Swap the registers M_k, M_1 . Introduce registers $O_{k+1} \dots O_b$ in the state $|0^{b-k}\rangle\langle 0^{b-k}|_{O_{k+1} \dots O_b}$ and exit.
 - If the outcome obtained in register O_k is $|1\rangle\langle 1|$, update $k \rightarrow k+1$ and then $\rho_0 = \Phi''_{B'M_k} \otimes \sigma^{-k}$, $\rho_1 = \frac{1}{b-k} \sum_{j=k+1}^b \Phi''_{B'M_j} \otimes \sigma^{-j}$.
 - Introduce a new register O_k . Goto Step (i).

- Final state is obtained in the registers $RA'B'M_1$. We call it $\Phi_{RB'A'M_1}^1$.

We have the following claim.

Claim 4. It holds that $F^2(\Phi_{RB'A'M_1}^1, \Phi_{RB'A'M_1}) \geq 1 - 25\varepsilon_2^2$.

Proof. We consider the action the quantum operation $\mathcal{P}_B$ on the state

$$\mu''_{RB'A'M_1M_2 \dots M_b} = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{j=1}^b |\Phi''\rangle\langle\Phi''|_{RB'A'M_j} \otimes \sigma_{M_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_{j-1}} \otimes \sigma_{M_{j+1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_b}.$$

Since $\Phi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Phi)$, we have that $P(\mu'', \mu^{(2)}) \leq \varepsilon_2$.

For every k , define the following series of states in registers $RB'A'M_1 \dots M_b O_1 \dots O_k$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{(k)} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{b} \sum_{k'=1}^k |\Phi''\rangle\langle\Phi''|_{RB'A'M_{k'}} \otimes \sigma^{-k'} \otimes |1^{k'-1} 0^{k-k'+1}\rangle\langle 1^{k'-1} 0^{k-k'+1}|_{O_1 \dots O_k} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{b} \sum_{k'=k+1}^b |\Phi''\rangle\langle\Phi''|_{RB'A'M_j} \otimes \sigma^{-j} \otimes |1^k\rangle\langle 1^k|_{O_1 \dots O_k}. \end{aligned}$$

For $k = 0$, we set $\Omega^{(0)} = \mu''_{RB'A'M_1 \dots M_b}$. Let the state after k runs of operation $\mathcal{P}_B$ on μ'' be $\mu_{RB'A'M_1M_2 \dots M_b}^{(k)}$.

At certain step k , a quantum operation $\mathcal{A}$ is made conditioned on registers $O_1 \dots O_{k-1}$ in the state $|1^{k-1}\rangle\langle 1^{k-1}|_{O_1 \dots O_{k-1}}$ (which ensures that the protocol did not exit in the previous step). Let the global quantum operation be abbreviated as $\mathcal{A}^k$. We consider the following quantity, which computes the loss in fidelity if operation $\mathcal{A}^k$ was done on $\Omega^{(k-1)}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
F(\Omega^{(k)}, \mathcal{A}^k(\Omega^{(k-1)})) &\geq \\
\frac{k-1}{b} + \frac{b-k+1}{b} \cdot (1 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{b-k+1}(1 - \frac{1}{b-k+1})}) F(\Phi''_{B'M_k} \otimes \sigma^{-k}, \frac{1}{b-k} \sum_{j=k+1}^b \Phi''_{B'M_j} \otimes \sigma^{-j})^{3/2} \\
&\geq \frac{k-1}{b} + \frac{b-k+1}{b} \cdot (1 - \sqrt{\frac{b-k}{(b-k+1)^2}} F(\Phi''_{B'M_1}, \Phi''_{B'} \otimes \sigma_{M_1}))^{3/2} \\
&\geq 1 - 2 \frac{\sqrt{b-k}}{b} \cdot F(\Phi''_{B'M_1}, \Phi''_{B'} \otimes \sigma_{M_1})
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since $\mathcal{A}^k$ acts as identity if state in registers $O_1 \dots O_k$ is not $|1^k\rangle\langle 1^k|_{O_1 \dots O_k}$ and then we apply Fact 13. The second inequality follows from monotonicity of fidelity under quantum operation (Fact 8).

This allows us to conclude that

$$P(\Omega^{(k)}, \mathcal{A}^k(\Omega^{(k-1)})) \leq 4 \cdot \frac{\sqrt{b-k}}{b} \cdot F(\Phi''_{B'M_1}, \Phi''_{B'} \otimes \sigma_{M_1}).$$

Thus, by triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 6), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\mathcal{A}^b \circ \dots \mathcal{A}^2 \circ \mathcal{A}^1(\mu''), \Omega^{(b)}) &= P(\mathcal{A}^b \circ \dots \mathcal{A}^2 \circ \mathcal{A}^1(\Omega^{(0)}), \Omega^{(b)}) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^b P(\mathcal{A}^b \circ \dots \mathcal{A}^k(\Omega^{(k-1)}), \mathcal{A}^b \circ \dots \mathcal{A}^{k+1}(\Omega^{(k)})) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=1}^b P(\mathcal{A}^k(\Omega^{(k-1)}), \Omega^{(k)}) \\
&\leq \frac{4}{b} \cdot F(\Phi''_{B'M_1}, \Phi''_{B'} \otimes \sigma_{M_1}) \sum_{k=1}^b \sqrt{b-k} \\
&\leq 3\sqrt{b} \cdot F(\Phi''_{B'M_1}, \Phi''_{B'} \otimes \sigma_{M_1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling the expressing for $\Omega^{(b)}$, we note that swapping $M_{k'}$ with M_k conditioned on $|1^{k'-1}0^{b-k'+1}\rangle\langle 1^{k'-1}0^{b-k'+1}|_{O_1 \dots O_b}$ gives the state $\Phi''_{RB'A'M_1}$ in registers $RA'B'M_1$. Thus, we conclude that

$$P(\Phi^1_{RB'A'M_1}, \Phi''_{RB'A'M_1}) \leq P(\mu'', \mu_2) + P(\mathcal{A}^b \circ \dots \mathcal{A}^2 \circ \mathcal{A}^1(\mu''), \Omega^{(b)}) \leq 4\varepsilon_2,$$

by plugging in the choice of b . Thus, $P(\Phi^1_{RB'A'M_1}, \Phi_{RB'A'M_1}) \leq 5\varepsilon_2$, as $\Phi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Phi)$.

This proves the claim. □

This shows that protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$ succeeds with fidelity squared as given in the claim. Now we proceed to construct the actual protocol.

Consider the state,

$$\xi_{RB'M_1 \dots M_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Phi_{RB'} \otimes \sigma_{M_1} \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_n}.$$

Let $|\theta\rangle_{L_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n} = |\sigma\rangle_{L_1 M_1} \otimes |\sigma\rangle_{L_2 M_2} \dots |\sigma\rangle_{L_n M_n}$ be a purification of $\sigma_{M_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_{M_n}$. Let

$$|\xi\rangle_{RA'B'M L_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\Phi\rangle_{RA'B'M} \otimes |\theta\rangle_{L_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n}.$$

Using corollary of convex-split lemma (Corollary 2) and choice of n we have,

$$F^2(\xi_{RB'M_1 \dots M_n}, \mu_{RB'M_1 \dots M_n}) \geq 1 - 9\varepsilon_1^2.$$

Let $|\xi'\rangle_{RB'JL_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n}$ be a purification of $\xi_{RB'M_1 \dots M_n}$ (guaranteed by Uhlmann's theorem, Fact 9) such that,

$$F^2(|\xi'\rangle\langle\xi'|_{RB'JL_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n}, |\mu\rangle\langle\mu|_{RB'JL_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n}) = F^2(\xi_{RB'M_1 \dots M_n}, \mu_{RB'M_1 \dots M_n}) \geq 1 - 9\varepsilon_1^2.$$

Let $V' : A'ML_1 \dots L_n \rightarrow JL_1 \dots L_n$ be an isometry (guaranteed by Uhlmann's theorem, Fact 9) such that,

$$V'|\xi\rangle_{RA'B'ML_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n} = |\xi'\rangle_{RB'JL_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n}.$$

Consider the following protocol $\mathcal{P}$.

1. Alice, Bob and Referee start by sharing the state $|\xi\rangle_{RA'B'ML_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n}$ between themselves where Alice holds registers $A'ML_1 \dots L_n$, Referee holds the register R and Bob holds the registers $B'M_1 \dots M_n$. Note that $|\Psi\rangle_{RA'B'M}$ is provided as input to the protocol and $|\theta\rangle_{L_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n}$ is additional shared entanglement between Alice and Bob.
2. Alice applies isometry V' to obtain state $|\xi'\rangle_{RB'JL_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n}$, where Alice holds registers $JL_1 \dots L_n$, Referee holds the register R and Bob holds the registers $B'M_1 \dots M_n$.
3. Alice and Bob simulate protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$ from Step 2. onwards.

Let $\Phi'_{RA'B'M}$ be the output of protocol $\mathcal{P}$. Since quantum maps (the entire protocol $\mathcal{P}_1$ can be viewed as a quantum map from input to output) do not decrease fidelity (monotonicity of fidelity under quantum operation, Fact 8), we have,

$$F^2(\Phi_{RA'B'M}^1, \Phi'_{RA'B'M}) \geq F^2(|\xi'\rangle\langle\xi'|_{RB'JL_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n}, |\mu\rangle\langle\mu|_{RB'JL_1 \dots L_n M_1 \dots M_n}) \geq 1 - 9\varepsilon_1^2 \quad (15)$$

This implies by claim 4 and triangle inequality for purified distance (Fact 6) that $F^2(\Phi'_{RA'B'M}, \Phi_{RA'B'M}) \geq 1 - (3\varepsilon_1 + 5\varepsilon_2)^2$. That is, $\Phi'_{RA'B'M} \in \mathcal{B}^{3\varepsilon_1 + 5\varepsilon_2}(\Phi_{RA'B'M})$.

The number of qubits communicated by Alice to Bob in $\mathcal{P}$ is equal to the number of qubits communicated in $\mathcal{P}_1$ and is upper bounded by:

$$\frac{\log(n/b)}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\inf_{\Phi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Phi)} D_{\max}(\Phi'_{RB'M} \| \Phi'_{RB'} \otimes \sigma_M) - \sup_{\Phi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Phi)} D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Phi''_{B'M} \| \Phi''_{B'} \otimes \sigma_M) \right) + \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1 \cdot \varepsilon_2}\right).$$

□

An achievability bound for quantum state redistribution

Quantum state redistribution is the following coherent quantum task.

Quantum state redistribution task: Alice, Bob and Referee share a pure state $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$, with AC belonging to Alice, B to Bob and R to Referee. Alice wants to transfer the register C to Bob, such that the final state Φ_{RABC} satisfies $F(\Phi_{RABC}, \Psi_{RABC}) \geq \sqrt{1 - \varepsilon^2}$, for a given $\varepsilon \geq 0$.

Using the Theorem 5, the authors in [[9]] showed that the following quantity tightly captures the quantum communication cost of quantum state redistribution.

Definition 2 ([9]). Let $\varepsilon \geq 0$ and $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ be a pure state. Define,

$$Q_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}^\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf_{T, U_{BCT}, \sigma_T, \kappa_{RBCT}} I_{\max}(RB : CT)_\kappa$$

with the condition that U_{BCT} is a unitary on registers BCT , $\sigma_T \in \mathcal{D}(T)$, $\kappa_{RB} = \Psi_{RB}$ and

$$(\mathbb{I}_R \otimes U_{BCT})\kappa_{RBCT}(\mathbb{I}_R \otimes U_{BCT}^\dagger) \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_{RBC} \otimes \sigma'_T).$$

One of their main results is as follows.

Theorem 7 ([9]). *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$ and $\Psi_{RABC} \in \mathcal{D}(RABC)$ be a pure state. There exists an entanglement-assisted one-way protocol $\mathcal{P}$, which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ shared between three parties Referee (R) Bob (B) and Alice (AC) and outputs a state Φ_{RABC} shared between Referee (R), Bob (BC) and Alice (A) such that $\Phi_{RABC} \in \mathcal{B}^{3\varepsilon}(\Psi_{RABC})$. The number of qubits communicated by Alice to Bob in $\mathcal{P}$ is upper bounded by:*

$$\frac{1}{2}Q_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}^\varepsilon + \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

Furthermore, for any one way quantum protocol $\mathcal{P}$ which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ shared between three parties Referee (R) Bob (B) and Alice (AC) and outputs a state Φ_{RABC} shared between Referee (R), Bob (BC) and Alice (A) such that $\Phi_{RABC} \in \mathcal{B}^\varepsilon(\Psi_{RABC})$, the number of qubits communicated must be at least

$$\frac{1}{2}Q_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}^\varepsilon$$

Using our compression result Theorem 6, we could improve upon the achievability in terms of $Q_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}^\varepsilon$. But this would not yield a substantially better bound, as the quantity $Q_{|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}}^\varepsilon$ is already nearly optimal. On the other hand, this quantity has the drawback of being a complex optimization problem. In below, we present a new achievability bound using Theorem 6, which is simpler to understand and gives the correct characterization of quantum communication cost of quantum state redistribution in asymptotic setting.

Theorem 8. *Let $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \in (0, 1/3)$ and $\Psi_{RABC} \in \mathcal{D}(RABC)$ be a pure state. There exists an entanglement-assisted one-way protocol $\mathcal{P}$, which takes as input $|\Psi\rangle_{RABC}$ shared between three parties Referee (R) Bob (B) and Alice (AC) and outputs a state Φ_{RABC} shared between Referee (R), Bob (BC) and Alice (A) such that $\Phi_{RABC} \in \mathcal{B}^{3\varepsilon_1+5\varepsilon_2}(\Psi_{RABC})$. The number of qubits communicated by Alice to Bob in $\mathcal{P}$ is upper bounded by:*

$$\min \left[\inf_{\sigma_C} \frac{1}{2} \left(\inf_{\Psi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Psi)} D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RBC} \| \Psi'_{RB} \otimes \sigma_C) - \sup_{\Psi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Psi)} D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi''_{BC} \| \Psi''_B \otimes \sigma_C) \right) + \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1 \cdot \varepsilon_2}\right), \right. \\ \left. \inf_{\sigma_C} \frac{1}{2} \left(\inf_{\Psi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Psi)} D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RAC} \| \Psi'_{RA} \otimes \sigma_C) - \sup_{\Psi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Psi)} D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi''_{AC} \| \Psi''_A \otimes \sigma_C) \right) + \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1 \cdot \varepsilon_2}\right) \right]$$

Proof. Consider an arbitrary state σ_C . Alice, Bob and Referee started with the state Ψ_{RABC} and followed the protocol as presented in the proof of Theorem 6, with M replaced with C , B' replaced with B and A' replaced with A . The resulting state Φ'_{RABC} satisfies $\Phi'_{RABC} \in \mathcal{B}^{3\varepsilon_1+5\varepsilon_2}(\Psi_{RABC})$ and the communication cost of the protocol is

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\inf_{\Psi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Psi)} D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RBC} \| \Psi'_{RB} \otimes \sigma_C) - \sup_{\Psi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Psi)} D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi''_{BC} \| \Psi''_B \otimes \sigma_C) \right) + \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1 \cdot \varepsilon_2}\right).$$

A similar protocol can be obtained where the register C is originally with Bob and Bob sends his register C to Alice. By reversing this protocol, one can achieve the task as stated in the theorem. This gives us the following upper bound on communication cost:

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\inf_{\Psi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Psi)} D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RAC} \| \Psi'_{RA} \otimes \sigma_C) - \sup_{\Psi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Psi)} D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi''_{AC} \| \Psi''_A \otimes \sigma_C) \right) + \log\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1 \cdot \varepsilon_2}\right).$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Comparison with previous work

In [8], following bound was shown for quantum state redistribution of Ψ_{RABC} with error $5\sqrt{\varepsilon_1} + 2\sqrt{\varepsilon_2}$, for $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$:

$$\frac{1}{2} (H_{\max}^{\varepsilon_1}(C|B)_{\Psi} - H_{\min}^{\varepsilon_2}(C|RB)_{\Psi}) + \mathcal{O}(\log \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1 \cdot \varepsilon_2}).$$

In this section, we show that this quantity is an upper bound on our achievability result obtained in Theorem 8. For this, we will need the following fact, shown implicitly in [27] and used explicitly in [24] (Claim 5, Appendix A).

Fact 15. *For quantum states $\psi_{AB}, \sigma_A, \sigma_B$, there exists a state $\bar{\psi}_{AB} \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon}(\psi_{AB})$ such that*

$$D_{\max}(\bar{\psi}_{AB} \| \bar{\psi}_A \otimes \sigma_B) \leq D_{\max}(\psi_{AB} \| \sigma_A \otimes \sigma_B) + \log \frac{3}{\varepsilon^2}.$$

Now, we prove our main result of this section.

Theorem 9. *Let μ_C be the maximally mixed state on register C and $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 > 0$. It holds that*

$$\inf_{\Psi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Psi)} D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RBC} \| \Psi'_{RB} \otimes \mu_C) - \sup_{\Psi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Psi)} D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi''_{BC} \| \Psi''_B \otimes \mu_C) \leq H_{\max}^{\varepsilon_2}(C|B)_{\Psi} - H_{\min}^{\varepsilon_1/2}(C|RB)_{\Psi} + \log \frac{12}{\varepsilon_1^2}.$$

Proof. Using Fact 15, we have that

$$\inf_{\Psi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Psi)} D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RBC} \| \Psi'_{RB} \otimes \mu_C) \leq \inf_{\Psi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1/2}(\Psi)} \inf_{\sigma_{RB}} D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RBC} \| \sigma_{RB} \otimes \mu_C) + \log \frac{12}{\varepsilon_1^2}.$$

But, the definition of conditional min-entropy implies that

$$\inf_{\sigma_{RB}} D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RBC} \| \sigma_{RB} \otimes \mu_C) = \inf_{\sigma_{RB}} D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RBC} \| \sigma_{RB} \otimes I_C) + \log d_C = -H_{\min}(C|RB)_{\Psi'} + \log d_C.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\Psi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Psi)} D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RBC} \| \Psi'_{RB} \otimes \mu_C) &\leq \inf_{\Psi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1/2}(\Psi)} -H_{\min}(C|RB)_{\Psi'} + \log d_C + \log \frac{12}{\varepsilon_1^2} \\ &= - \sup_{\Psi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1/2}(\Psi)} H_{\min}(C|RB)_{\Psi'} + \log d_C + \log \frac{12}{\varepsilon_1^2} \\ &= -H_{\min}^{\varepsilon_1/2}(C|RB)_{\Psi} + \log d_C + \log \frac{12}{\varepsilon_1^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

On the other hand,

$$-D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi''_{BC} \| \Psi''_B \otimes \mu_C) = \log F^2(\Psi''_{BC}, \Psi''_B \otimes \mu_C) = \log F^2(\Psi''_{BC}, \Psi''_B \otimes I_C) - \log d_C.$$

But, from the definition of conditional max-entropy, $\log F^2(\Psi''_{BC}, \Psi''_B \otimes I_C) \leq H_{\max}(C|B)_{\Psi''}$. Thus,

$$- \sup_{\Psi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Psi)} D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi''_{BC} \| \Psi''_B \otimes \mu_C) \leq \min_{\Psi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Psi)} H_{\max}(C|B)_{\Psi''} - \log d_C = H_{\max}^{\varepsilon_2}(C|B)_{\Psi} - \log d_C.$$

Combining this with Equation 16, we obtain that

$$\inf_{\Psi' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_1}(\Psi)} D_{\max}(\Psi'_{RBC} \| \Psi'_{RB} \otimes \mu_C) - \sup_{\Psi'' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon_2}(\Psi)} D_{\frac{1}{2}}(\Psi''_{BC} \| \Psi''_B \otimes \mu_C) \leq H_{\max}^{\varepsilon_2}(C|B)_{\Psi} - H_{\min}^{\varepsilon_1/2}(C|RB)_{\Psi} + \log \frac{12}{\varepsilon_1^2}.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Acknowledgment

We thank Mark M. Wilde for helpful comments on an earlier version of our paper. This work is supported by the Singapore Ministry of Education and the National Research Foundation, also through the Tier 3 Grant Random numbers from quantum processes MOE2012-T3-1-009.

References

- [1] I. Devetak and J. Yard, “Exact cost of redistributing multipartite quantum states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 100, 2008.
- [2] J. T. Yard and I. Devetak, “Optimal quantum source coding with quantum side information at the encoder and decoder,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, pp. 5339–5351, 2009.
- [3] M.-Y. Ye, Y.-K. Bai, and Z. D. Wang, “Quantum state redistribution based on a generalized decoupling,” *Physical Review A*, vol. 78, 2008.
- [4] J. Oppenheim, “State redistribution as merging: introducing the coherent relay.” <http://arxiv.org/abs/0805.1065>, 2008.
- [5] A. Abeyesinghe, I. Devetak, P. Hayden, and A. Winter, “The mother of all protocols: Restructuring quantum information’s family tree,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, vol. A, pp. 2537–2563, 2009.
- [6] N. Datta, M.-H. Hsieh, and J. Oppenheim, “Optimality of one-shot state redistribution.” In preparation, 2014.
- [7] N. Datta, M.-H. Hsieh, and J. Oppenheim, “An upper bound on the second order asymptotic expansion for the quantum communication cost of state redistribution.” <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.4352>, 2014.
- [8] M. Berta, M. Christandl, and D. Touchette, “Smooth entropy bounds on one-shot quantum state redistribution,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 62, pp. 1425–1439, March 2016.
- [9] A. Anshu, V. K. Devabathini, and R. Jain, “Quantum message compression with applications.” arXiv:1410.3031, 2014.
- [10] M. Braverman and A. Rao, “Information equals amortized communication,” in *Proceedings of the 52nd Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS ’11*, (Washington, DC, USA), pp. 748–757, IEEE Computer Society, 2011.
- [11] M. Tomamichel and M. Hayashi, “A hierarchy of information quantities for finite block length analysis of quantum tasks,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 59, pp. 7693–7710, Nov 2013.
- [12] K. Li, “Second-order asymptotics for quantum hypothesis testing,” *Ann. Statist.*, vol. 42, pp. 171–189, 02 2014.
- [13] R. Renner, “Security of quantum key distribution.” PhD Thesis, ETH Zurich, Diss. ETH No. 16242, arXiv:quant-ph/0512258, 2005.
- [14] M. Tomamichel, R. Colbeck, and R. Renner, “Duality between smooth min- and max-entropies,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 56, pp. 4674 – 4681, 2010.
- [15] M. Tomamichel, “A framework for non-asymptotic quantum information theory,” 2012. PhD Thesis, ETH Zurich.
- [16] N. Datta, “Min- and max- relative entropies and a new entanglement monotone,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 55, pp. 2816–2826, 2009.
- [17] W. F. Stinespring, “Positive functions on c^* -algebras,” *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, p. 211216, 1955.

- [18] H. Barnum, C. M. Cave, C. A. Fuchs, R. Jozsa, and B. Schumacher, “Noncommuting mixed states cannot be broadcast,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 76, no. 15, pp. 2818–2821, 1996.
- [19] G. Lindblad, “Completely positive maps and entropy inequalities,” *Commun. Math. Phys.*, vol. 40, pp. 147–151, 1975.
- [20] A. Uhlmann, “The ”transition probability” in the state space of a $*$ -algebra,” *Rep. Math. Phys.*, vol. 9, pp. 273–279, 1976.
- [21] A. Winter, “Coding theorem and strong converse for quantum channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 45, no. 7, pp. 2481–2485, 1999.
- [22] T. Ogawa and H. Nagaoka, “A new proof of the channel coding theorem via hypothesis testing in quantum information theory,” in *Information Theory, 2002. Proceedings. 2002 IEEE International Symposium on*, pp. 73–, 2002.
- [23] M. Hayashi and H. Nagaoka, “A general formula for the classical capacity of a general quantum channel,” in *Proceedings IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*, pp. 71–, 2002.
- [24] A. Anshu, R. Jain, and N. A. Warsi, “One shot entanglement assisted classical and quantum communication over noisy quantum channels: A hypothesis testing and convex split approach.” <https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.01940>, 2017.
- [25] H. Barnum and E. Knill, “Reversing quantum dynamics with near-optimal quantum and classical fidelity,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 43, no. 5, pp. 2097–2106, 2002.
- [26] C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, “Communication via one- and two-particle operators on einstein-podolsky-rosen states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 69, no. 20, pp. 2881–2884, 1992.
- [27] N. Ciganovic, N. J. Beaudry, and R. Renner, “Smooth max-information as one-shot generalization for mutual information,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 60, pp. 1573–1581, 2014.